

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/806,080  
Amendment dated November 17, 2006  
Response to Office Action dated September 11, 2006

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 17 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and continued examination of the above-identified application are respectfully requested.

In the amendment, claim 192 has been amended to replace the term "obtainable" with the term "obtained." The scope of this claim remains the same. Accordingly, no questions of new matter should arise and entry of this amendment is respectfully requested.

**Rejection of Claim 192 Under 35 U.S.C. §112 – Second Paragraph**

At page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 192 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner has requested that the term "obtainable" be replaced with the term "obtained by." For the following reasons, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Since the scope of the claim remains the same, this term has been replaced in the claim as requested by the Examiner. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

**Non-Statutory Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Rejections**

At pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 154-179, 199, and 200 on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 18-19 of U.S. Patent No. 5,554,739. The Examiner further rejected claims 183-198, 201, and 202 on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No. 5,559,169. The Examiner asserts that although the conflicting claims are not identical, they would not be patentably distinct. For the following reasons, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/806,080  
Amendment dated November 17, 2006  
Response to Office Action dated September 11, 2006


Though the applicants do not agree with the Examiner and believe the claims can be considered patentably distinct for the reasons set forth in the Amendment filed June 28, 2006, a Terminal Disclaimer is being submitted with this response. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to Deposit Account No. 03-0060. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such extension is requested and should also be charged to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Luke A. Kilyk  
Reg. No. 33,251

Atty. Docket No.: 356,660CIP1CON5 (3600-151-02)  
KILYK & BOWERSOX, P.L.L.C.  
400 Holiday Court, Suite 102  
Warrenton, VA 20186  
Tel.: (540) 428-1701  
Fax: (540) 428-1720